arXiv:1207.1605v1 [math.PR] 6 Jul 2012

MODERATE DEVIATIONS IN POISSON APPROXIMATION: A FIRST ATTEMPT

Louis H. Y. Chen, Xiao Fang and Qi-Man Shao

National University of Singapore, National University of Singapore and Hong Kong University of Science and Technology

Abstract: Poisson approximation using Stein's method has been extensively studied in the literature. The main focus has been on bounding the total variation distance. This paper is a first attempt on moderate deviations in Poisson approximation for dependent indicators. We obtain general results under local dependence as well as size-bias coupling. The results are then applied to independent indicators, 2-runs and the matching problem.

Key words and phrases: Stein's method, moderate deviations, Poisson approximation, local dependence, size-bias coupling.

1. Introduction

Poisson approximation using Stein's method has been extensively studied in the literature. It has been applied to many areas ranging from computer science to computational biology. The main focus has been on bounding the total variation distance between the distribution of a sum of dependent indicators and the Poisson distribution with the same mean.

Broadly speaking, there are two main approaches to Poisson approximation, the local approach and the coupling approach. The local approach was first studied by Chen (1975) and developed further by Arratia, Goldstein and Gordon (1989, 1990), who presented Chen's results in a form which is easy to use and applied them to a wide range of problems including problems in extreme values, random graphs and molecular biology. The coupling approach, which dates back to Barbour (1982) and Stein (1986, page 93), was developed by Barbour, Holst and Janson (1992), who introduced monotone coupling and applied their results to random graphs and many combinatorial problems. A recent review of Poisson approximation by Chatterjee, Diaconis and Meckes (2005) used Stein's method of exchangeable pairs to study classical problems in combinatorial probability. They also reviewed the coupling approach as suggested in Stein (1986, page 93).

Although there is a vast literature on Poisson approximation, relatively little has been done on such refinements as moderate deviations. For sums of independent indicators, moderate deviations has been studied by Barbour, Holst and Janson (1992), Chen and Choi (1992), and Barbour, Chen and Choi (1995). The latter two actually considered the more general problem of unbounded function approximation and deduced moderate deviations as a special case. However no such results seem to have been obtained for dependent indicators. This is probably due to the fact that unbounded function approximation becomes much harder for dependent indicators. Indeed, the paper by Barbour, Chen and Choi (1995) was intended to be the first of two papers with the second being on dependent indicators (as was indicated in the title), but the second paper never materializes due to the difficulty of the problem. Although moderate deviations is a special case of unbounded function approximation, it is of a similar nature as the latter and as such it is also a difficult problem for dependent indicators.

This paper is a first attempt on moderate deviations in Poisson approximation for dependent indicators. We take both the local and coupling approach. Under the local approach we consider locally dependent indicators. Under the coupling approach we consider size-bias coupling, which is a general framework for the coupling approach of Barbour, Holst and Janson (1992) and of Stein (1986) as reviewed by Chatterjee, Diaconis and Meckes (2005).

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 contains the main theorems, Section 3 applications and Section 4 the proofs of the main theorems.

2. Main Theorems

In this section, we state two general theorems on moderate deviations in Poisson approximation, one under local dependence and the other under size-bias coupling.

2.1 Local dependence

Local dependence is a widely used dependence structure for Poisson approximation. We refer to Arratia, Goldstein and Gordon (1989, 1990) for results on the total variation distance and applications. We prove a moderate deviation result under local dependence. Let $X_i, i \in \mathcal{J}$, be random indicators indexed by

$\mathcal{J} = \{1, \cdots, n\}$. Let $W = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{J}} X_i$,

$$p_i = P(X_i = 1), \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{J}} p_i > 0 \ . \tag{2.1}$$

Suppose for each $i \in \mathcal{J}$, there exists a subset B_i of $\mathcal{J}$ such that X_i is independent of $\{X_j : j \notin B_i\}$. The subset B_i is called a dependence neighborhood of X_i. Assume that

$$\max_{i \in \mathcal{J}} |B_i| \le m, \tag{2.2}$$

and for some $\delta, \theta > 0$,

$$E(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{J}} \sum_{j \in B_i \setminus \{i\}} X_i X_j | W = w) \le \delta w^2 \text{ for } w \le \theta. \tag{2.3}$$

Let $\tilde{p} = \max_{i \in \mathcal{J}} p_i$. Then we have the following moderate deviation result for W.

Theorem 2.1. *Let $W = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{J}} X_i$ be a sum of locally dependent random indicators with dependence neighborhoods B_i satisfying* (2.2) *and* (2.3). *Then there exist absolute positive constants c, C such that for $k \ge \lambda$ satisfying*

$$k \le \theta / Cm, \quad \tilde{p}(1 + \xi^2) + \delta\lambda(1 + \xi^2 + \frac{\xi^3}{\sqrt{\lambda}}) \le c$$

where $\xi = (k - \lambda)/\sqrt{\lambda}$, we have

$$\Big| \frac{P(W \ge k)}{P(Y \ge k)} - 1 \Big| \quad \le \quad C \Big\{ \tilde{p}(1 + \xi^2) + \delta\lambda(1 + \xi^2 + \frac{\xi^3}{\sqrt{\lambda}}) \Big\} + C(1 \wedge \frac{1}{\lambda}) m^2 \exp(-\frac{c\theta}{m})$$

where $Y \sim Poi(\lambda)$.

2.2 Size-bias coupling

Baldi, Rinott and Stein (1989) and Goldstein and Rinott (1996) used size-bias coupling to prove normal approximation results by Stein's method. In the context of Stein's method for Poisson approximation, size-bias coupling was used implicitly by Stein (1986, page 93), Barbour, Holst and Janson (1992, page 23) and Chatterjee, Diaconis and Meckes (2005, page 93). The following definition of size-bias distribution can be found in Goldstein and Rinott (1996).

Definition 2.1. *Let W be a non-negative random variable. We say that W^s has the W-size biased distribution if*

$$EWf(W) = \lambda Ef(W^s) \tag{2.4}$$

for all functions f such that the expectations exist.

In this paper we assume W to be a non-negative integer valued random variable, in particular, a sum of random indicators. If we can couple W with W^s on the same probability space, then we have the following bound on the total variation distance between $\mathcal{L}(W)$ and a Poisson distribution.

Theorem 2.2. *Let W be a non-negative integer valued random variable with $EW = \lambda > 0$. Let W^s be defined on the same probability space as W and has the W-size biased distribution. Then we have*

$$\|\mathcal{L}(W) - Poi(\lambda)\|_{TV} \leq (1 - e^{-\lambda})E|W + 1 - W^s|. \tag{2.5}$$

Proof. Let $h(w) = I(w \in A)$ for $w \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ where A is any given subset of $\mathbb{Z}^+$. Let f_h be the bounded solution (unique except at $w = 0$) to the Stein equation

$$\lambda f(w + 1) - wf(w) = h(w) - Eh(Y) \tag{2.6}$$

where $Y \sim Poi(\lambda)$. It is known that (see, for example, Barbour, Holst and Janson (1992, page 7))

$$\Delta f_h := \sup_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^+, j \geq 1} |f_h(j + 1) - f_h(j)| \leq \lambda^{-1}(1 - e^{-\lambda}). \tag{2.7}$$

From (2.6) and the fact that W^s has the W-size biased distribution and is coupled with W, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |P(W \in A) - P(Y \in A)| &= |\lambda E f_h(W + 1) - EW f_h(W)| \\ &= \lambda |E(f_h(W + 1) - f_h(W^s))| \\ &\leq \lambda \Delta f_h E|W + 1 - W^s| \\ &\leq (1 - e^{-\lambda})E|W + 1 - W^s| \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality was obtained by writing $f_h(W + 1) - f_h(W^s)$ as a telescoping sum and using the definition of Δf_h along with the fact that $W^s \geq 1$. The second inequality follows from (2.7). Taking supremum over A yields (2.5). □

Similar results as Theorem 2.2 and their proofs can be found in Barbour, Holst and Janson (1992) and Chatterjee, Diaconis and Meckes (2005). In order for the bound (2.5) to be useful, we need to couple W with W^s such that $E|W + 1 - W^s|$ is small. A general way of constructing such size-bias couplings for sums of random indicators is as follows; see, for example, Goldstein and Rinott (1996). Let $\mathbb{X} = \{X_i\}_{i\in\mathcal{J}}$ where $\mathcal{J} = \{1, \ldots, n\}$ be $\{0, 1\}$-valued random variables with $P(X_i = 1) = p_i$, $\lambda = \sum_{i\in\mathcal{J}} p_i$, and let $W = \sum_{i\in\mathcal{J}} X_i$. Let $I \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ be independent of X with $P(I = i) = p_i/\lambda$. Given I, construct $\mathbb{X}^I = \{X_j^I\}_{j\in\mathcal{J}}$ on the same probability space as X such that

$$\mathcal{L}(X_j^I : j \in \mathcal{J}) = \mathcal{L}(X_j : j \in \mathcal{J} | X_I = 1).$$

Then $W^s = \sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}} X_j^I$ has the W-size biased distribution.

Under the setting of size-bias coupling, we prove the following moderate deviation result for Poisson approximation.

Theorem 2.3. *Let W be a non-negative integer valued random variable with $EW = \lambda > 0$. Let W^s be defined on the same probability space with W and have the W-size biased distribution. Assume that $\Delta := W + 1 - W^s \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$ and that there are non-negative constants δ_1, δ_2 such that*

$$P(\Delta = -1 \mid W) \le \delta_1, \quad P(\Delta = 1 \mid W) \le \delta_2 W. \tag{2.8}$$

For integers $k \ge \lambda$, let $\xi = (k - \lambda)/\sqrt{\lambda}$. Then there exist absolute positive constants c, C such that for

$$(\delta_1 + \delta_2\lambda)(1 + \xi^2) \le c,$$

we have

$$\Big|\frac{P(W \ge k)}{P(Y \ge k)} - 1\Big| \le C(\delta_1 + \delta_2\lambda)(1 + \xi^2) \tag{2.9}$$

where $Y \sim Poi(\lambda)$.

The conditions of Theorem 2.3 do not hold for all size-bias couplings. Nevertheless, in Section 3, we will be able to apply Theorem 2.3 to prove moderate deviation results for Poisson-binomial trials and the matching problem.

3. Applications

In this section, we apply our main results to 2-runs in a sequence of i.i.d. indicators, Poisson-binomial trials and the matching problem.

3.1. 2-runs.

Let $\{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n\}$ be i.i.d. *Bernoulli*(p) variables with $n > 10$, $p < 1/2$. For each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, let $X_i = \xi_i \xi_{i+1}$ where $\xi_{j+n} = \xi_{j-n} = \xi_j$ for any integer $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Define $W = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ with mean $\lambda = np^2$. Then W is a sum of locally dependent random variables with $m = 3$ where m is defined in (2.2). For each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and any positive integer $w \le cnp$ for some sufficiently small constant $c < 1/50$ to be chosen later, we write

$$\begin{aligned}
& P(X_i = 1, X_{i+1} = 1, W = w) \\
= & \sum_{\substack{m_1 \ge 0, m_2 \ge 1 \\ m_1 + m_2 < w}} P(X_{i-m_1} = \cdots = X_{i+m_2} = 1, X_{i-m_1-1} = X_{i+m_2+1} = 0, W = w) \\
=: & \sum_{\substack{m_1 \ge 0, m_2 \ge 1 \\ m_1 + m_2 < w}} a_{m_1, m_2}
\end{aligned}$$

where the sum is over integers. By writing

$$a_{m_1, m_2} = p^{m_1 + m_2 + 2} (1-p)^2 P\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{n-(m_1+m_2+5)} X_i = w - (m_1 + m_2 + 1) \Big),$$

we have for $m_1 + m_2 + 1 < w$,

$$\frac{a_{m_1, m_2+1}}{a_{m_1, m_2}} = p \frac{P(\sum_{i=1}^{n-(m_1+m_2+6)} X_i = w - (m_1 + m_2 + 2))}{P(\sum_{i=1}^{n-(m_1+m_2+5)} X_i = w - (m_1 + m_2 + 1))} \le Cp \frac{w}{\lambda} \tag{3.1}$$

for some positive constant C. The last inequality is proved by observing that for each event in the numerator $\{X_i : 1 \le i \le n - (m_1 + m_2 + 6)\}$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^{n-(m_1+m_2+6)} X_i = w - (m_1 + m_2 + 2)$, we can change one of the $\dots 000 \dots$ to $\dots 010 \dots$ and let $X_{n-(m_1+m_2+5)} = 0$, thus resulting in an event in the denominator with probability at least $c_1 p^2$ times the probability of the original event for an absolute positive constant c_1. Summing over the probabilities of all the events resulted in such way and correcting for the multiple counts yield the inequality in (3.1). By choosing c to be small,

$$\frac{a_{m_1, m_2+1}}{a_{m_1, m_2}} \le \frac{1}{4}.$$

Similarly,

$$\frac{a_{m_1+1, m_2}}{a_{m_1, m_2}} \le \frac{1}{4}.$$

Therefore,

$$P(X_i = 1, X_{i+1} = 1, W = w) \le Ca_{0,1} \le Cp^3 P(\sum_{i=1}^{n-6} X_i = w - 2).$$

Similar to (3.1),

$$P(\sum_{i=1}^{n-6} X_i = w - 2) \le C(w^2/\lambda^2) P(W = w).$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=i-1,i+1} E(X_i X_j | W = w) \\ = \; & 2nP(X_i = X_{i+1} = 1, W = w)/P(W = w) \\ \le \; & Cnp^3 w^2/\lambda^2 = \frac{C}{np} w^2 \end{aligned}$$

for $w \le cnp$ with sufficiently small c. Applying Theorem 2.1, there exist absolute positive constants c, C, such that for $k \ge \lambda$ and $p + p\xi^2 + \xi^3/\sqrt{n} \le c$ where $\xi = (k - \lambda)/\sqrt{\lambda}$,

$$\Big| \frac{P(W \ge k)}{P(Y \ge k)} - 1 \Big| \le C(p + p\xi^2 + \xi^3/\sqrt{n})$$

where $Y \sim Poi(\lambda)$. We remark that if $\lambda \asymp O(1)$, then the range of ξ above is of order $O(n^{1/6})$.

3.2. Poisson-binomial trials

Let $X_i, i \in \mathcal{J}$, be independent with $P(X_i = 1) = p_i = 1 - P(X_i = 0)$. Set $\lambda = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{J}} p_i$ and $\tilde{p} = \sup_{i \in \mathcal{J}} p_i$. Let $W = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{J}} X_i$. Following the general way of constructing size-bias coupling stated in Section 2.1, W^s in (2.4) can be constructed as $W^s = W - X_I + 1$ where I is independent of $\{X_i : i \in \mathcal{J}\}$ and $P(I = i) = p_i/\lambda$ for each $i \in \mathcal{J}$. Therefore, $\Delta = W + 1 - W^s = X_I$ and condition (2.8) is satisfied with

$$\delta_1 = 0, \quad \delta_2 = \tilde{p}/\lambda.$$

Applying Theorem 2.3, there exist absolute positive constants c, C such that

$$\Big| \frac{P(W \ge k)}{P(Y \ge k)} - 1 \Big| \le C\tilde{p}(1 + \xi^2) \tag{3.2}$$

for integers $k \geq \lambda$ and $\tilde{p}(1+\xi^2) \leq c$ where $Y \sim Poi(\lambda)$ and $\xi = (k-\lambda)/\sqrt{\lambda}$. The range $\tilde{p}(1+\xi^2) \leq c$ is optimal for i.i.d. case where $p_i = \tilde{p}$ for all $i \in \mathcal{J}$ (see Theorem 9.D of Barbour, Holst and Janson (1992, page 188) and Corollary 4.3 of Barbour, Chen and Choi (1995)).

Remark 3.1. *The moderate deviation result* (3.2) *also follows from Theorem 2.1 for sums of locally dependent random variables.*

3.3. Matching problem

For a positive integer n, let π be a uniform random permutation of $\{1,\dots,n\}$. Let $W = \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{i\pi(i)}$ be the number of fixed points in π. In Chatterjee, Diaconis and Meckes (2005), W^s satisfying (2.4) was constructed as follows. First pick I uniformly from $\{1,\dots,n\}$ and then set

$$\pi^s(j) = \begin{cases} I & \text{if } j = I \\ \pi(I) & \text{if } j = \pi^{-1}(I) \\ \pi(j) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Finally define $W^s = \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{i\pi^s(i)}$. With $\Delta = W + 1 - W^s$, we have

$$P(\Delta = 1|W) = W/n, \quad P(\Delta = -1|W) = E(2a_2|W)/n \leq 2/n$$

where a_2 is the number of transpositions of π and the last inequality follows by

$$E(2a_2|W) = (n-W)/(n-W-1) \leq 2$$

for $n - W \geq 2$ and $E(2a_2|W) = 0$ for $n - W \leq 1$. By Theorem 2.3 with $\lambda = 1$, there exist absolute positive constants c, C such that for all positive integers k satisfying $k^2/n \leq c$,

$$\left|\frac{P(W \geq k)}{P(Y \geq k)} - 1\right| \leq Ck^2/n.$$

We remark that the order $O(1/n)$ is the same as that of the total variation bounds proved in Barbour, Holst and Janson (1992) and Chatterjee, Diaconis and Meckes (2005). As remarked in both papers, this order is not optimal and it is an open problem to prove the actual order $O(2^n/n!)$ using Stein's method.

4. Proofs

We use c, C to denote absolute positive constants whose values may be different at each appearance. We start with two preliminary lemmas.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\lambda > 0$. Then for any integer $w \geq \lambda$,*

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \lambda^j \frac{w!(j+1)}{(j+w+1)!} \leq C. \tag{4.1}$$

Proof. By expanding the product $(w+j+1)\times\cdots\times(w+1)$ in terms of w and then bounding it below by the first two and three terms respectively in the expansion, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \lambda^j \frac{w!(j+1)}{(j+w+1)!} &\leq \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} w^j \frac{j+1}{(w+j+1)\times\cdots\times(w+1)} \\ &\leq C\Big[\sum_{j\leq\sqrt{w}} \frac{j}{w+j^2} + \sum_{j>\sqrt{w}} \frac{j}{w+j^2+j^4/w}\Big] \\ &\leq C\Big[\sum_{j\leq\sqrt{w}} \frac{j}{w} + \sum_{j>\sqrt{w}} \frac{w}{j^3}\Big] \\ &\leq C,\end{aligned}$$

as desired. □

Lemma 4.2. *Let $Y \sim Poi(\lambda)$ with $\lambda > 0$. Then we have*

$$P(Y \geq k) \geq c > 0 \text{ for all integer } k < \lambda, \tag{4.2}$$

$$\frac{P(Y \geq k)}{P(Y \geq k-1)} \geq \frac{\lambda}{\lambda+k} \text{ for all integer } k \geq 1 \tag{4.3}$$

and

$$P(Y \geq k) \leq P(Y = k)\frac{k+1}{k-\lambda+1} \text{ for all integer } k > \lambda - 1. \tag{4.4}$$

Proof. The inequality in (4.2) is trivial when $\lambda < 1$ or $1 \leq \lambda \leq C$ for some absolute constant C. When $\lambda > C$, we can use normal approximation to prove (4.2).

For (4.3), noting that

$$\begin{aligned}P(Y \geq k) &= P(Y = k)\Big(1 + \frac{\lambda}{k+1} + \frac{\lambda^2}{(k+1)(k+2)} + \cdots\Big) \\ &\geq \frac{\lambda+k+1}{k+1} P(Y = k),\end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\frac{P(Y\geq k)}{P(Y\geq k-1)}=1-\frac{P(Y=k-1)}{P(Y\geq k-1)}\geq 1-\frac{k}{\lambda+k}=\frac{\lambda}{\lambda+k}.$$

The inequality in (4.4) follows by observing that

$$\begin{aligned} P(Y\geq k) &= P(Y=k)(1+\frac{\lambda}{k+1}+\frac{\lambda^2}{(k+1)(k+2)}+\cdots) \\ &\leq P(Y=k)(1+\frac{\lambda}{k+1}+\frac{\lambda^2}{(k+1)^2}+\cdots) \\ &= P(Y=k)\frac{k+1}{k-\lambda+1}. \end{aligned}$$

□

To prove moderate deviation results for Poisson approximation, we need to study the properties of the bounded solution f_h (unique except at $w=0$) to the Stein equation

$$\lambda f(w+1)-wf(w)=h(w)-Eh(Y). \tag{4.5}$$

where $Y\sim Poi(\lambda)$ and $h(w)=I\{w\geq k\}$ for fixed integer $k\geq\lambda>0$. The bounded solution to (4.5) is

$$\begin{aligned} f_h(w) &= -\frac{e^{\lambda}(w-1)!}{\lambda^w}E(h(Y)-Eh(Y))I\{Y\geq w\} \\ &= \begin{cases} -\frac{e^{\lambda}(w-1)!}{\lambda^w}(1-P(Y\geq k))P(Y\geq w), & w\geq k \\ \\ -\frac{e^{\lambda}(w-1)!}{\lambda^w}P(Y\geq k)P(Y\leq w-1), & 0<w\leq k-1 \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

For $w\geq k$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{f_h(w)-f_h(w+1)}{1-P(Y\geq k)} &= \frac{e^{\lambda}w!}{\lambda^{w+1}}P(Y\geq w+1)-\frac{e^{\lambda}(w-1)!}{\lambda^w}P(Y\geq w) \\ &= \sum_{j=w+1}^{\infty}\frac{w!}{j!}\lambda^{j-w-1}-\sum_{j=w}^{\infty}\frac{(w-1)!}{j!}\lambda^{j-w} \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{\infty}\lambda^j(\frac{w!}{(j+w+1)!}-\frac{(w-1)!}{(j+w)!}) \\ &= -\sum_{j=0}^{\infty}\lambda^j\frac{(w-1)!(j+1)}{(j+w+1)!} \end{aligned}$$

and hence by (4.1)

$$0 < f_h(w+1) - f_h(w) \le \frac{C}{w+1} \quad \text{for } w \ge k. \tag{4.6}$$

For $w = k-1 \ge 1$, write

$$f_h(k-1) = f_g(k-1) - f_{\delta_{k-1}}(k-1)$$

where $g(w) = I\{w \ge k-1\}$ and $\delta_{k-1}(w) = I\{w = k-1\}$. Since

$$0 < f_{\delta_{k-1}}(k) - f_{\delta_{k-1}}(k-1) = \frac{P(Y \le k-2)}{k-1} + \frac{P(Y \ge k)}{\lambda} \le \frac{C}{k-1},$$

together with (4.6), we have

$$|f_h(k-1) - f_h(k)| \le \frac{C}{k-1}. \tag{4.7}$$

For $0 < w \le k-2$,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{f_h(w) - f_h(w+1)}{P(Y \ge k)} &= \frac{e^\lambda w!}{\lambda^{w+1}} P(Y \le w) - \frac{e^\lambda (w-1)!}{\lambda^w} P(Y \le w-1) \\ &= \frac{e^\lambda}{\lambda^{w+1}} \int_\lambda^\infty x^w e^{-x} dx - \frac{e^\lambda}{\lambda^w} \int_\lambda^\infty x^{w-1} e^{-x} dx \\ &= e^\lambda \int_1^\infty x^{w-1}(x-1) e^{-\lambda x} dx \\ &= \int_0^\infty x(1+x)^{w-1} e^{-\lambda x} dx.\end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

For a non-negative integer valued random variable W with $EW = \lambda > 0$, let

$$\eta_k := \sup_{\lambda \le r \le k} \frac{P(W \ge r)}{P(Y \ge r)} \tag{4.9}$$

where $Y \sim Poi(\lambda)$. By (4.2),

$$\sup_{0 \le r \le k} \frac{P(W \ge r)}{P(Y \ge r)} \le \eta_k + C. \tag{4.10}$$

We are now ready to prove our main theorems. We first give the proof of Theorem 2.3 which is easier than that of Theorem 2.1.

Proof of Theorem 2.3. For fixed integer $k \ge \lambda$, let $h(w) = I\{w \ge k\}$ and consider the Stein equation (4.5). Observe that by (2.4), for general f

$$E(\lambda f(W+1) - W f(W)) = \lambda E(f(W+1) - f(W^s)). \tag{4.11}$$

In particularly, for $f := f_h$,

$$\begin{aligned} Eh(W) - Eh(Y) =& \lambda E(f(W+1) - f(W^s)) \\ :=& H_1 + H_2 \end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} H_1 &= \lambda E(f(W+1) - f(W+2)) I\{\Delta = -1\}, \\ H_2 &= \lambda E(f(W+1) - f(W)) I\{\Delta = 1\}. \end{aligned}$$

Using (2.8), the definition of η_k in (4.9), and the properties of f_h, H_1 is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} |H_1| &\leq \lambda\delta_1 E|f(W+1) - f(W+2)|(I(W+1 \geq k-1) + I(W+1 < k-1)) \\ &\leq \lambda\delta_1 \frac{CP(W \geq k-2)}{k} \\ &\quad + \lambda\delta_1 P(Y \geq k) EI(W+1 \leq k-2) \int_0^\infty x(1+x)^{(W+1)-1} e^{-\lambda x} dx \\ &\leq CP(Y \geq k) \frac{\delta_1 k}{\lambda}(\eta_k + 1) + CP(Y \geq k)\delta_1 (1 + \frac{(k-\lambda)^2}{\lambda})(\eta_k + 1) \end{aligned}$$

where we used (4.10), (4.3) and (4.13) given in Lemma 4.3 below.

Similarly, H_2 can be bounded as

$$\begin{aligned} |H_2| &\leq \lambda\delta_2 EW|f(W) - f(W+1)|(I(W \geq k-1) + I(W < k-1)) \\ &\leq C\lambda\delta_2 P(W \geq k-1) \\ &\quad + \lambda\delta_2 P(Y \geq k) EI(W \leq k-2) W \int_0^\infty x(1+x)^{W-1} e^{-\lambda x} dx \\ &\leq CP(Y \geq k)\delta_2 (k+\lambda)(\eta_k + 1) + CP(Y \geq k)\delta_2 (k + (k-\lambda)^2)(\eta_k + 1). \end{aligned}$$

by (4.10), (4.3) and (4.14). Therefore, we obtain the following inequality.

$$|\frac{P(W \geq k)}{P(Y \geq k)} - 1| \leq C(\eta_k + 1)(\delta_1 + \delta_2\lambda)(1 + \xi^2).$$

Since the right-hand side of the above inequality is increasing in k, we have the following recursive inequality for η_k.

$$|\eta_k - 1| \leq C(\eta_k + 1)(\delta_1 + \delta_2\lambda)(1 + \xi^2).$$

The bound in (2.9) is proved by solving the above recursive inequality. $\square$

We now prove the following lemma used in the proof of Theorem 2.3.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $Y \sim Poi(\lambda)$ with $\lambda > 0$. Let W be an integer valued random variable and for integers $k \geq \lambda$, let η_k be defined as in (4.9). Then we have*

$$EI(W+1 \leq k-2)\int_0^\infty x(1+x)^{(W+1)-1}e^{-\lambda x}dx \leq C(\eta_k+1)(\frac{1}{\lambda}+\frac{(k-\lambda)^2}{\lambda^2}) \quad (4.13)$$

and

$$EI(W \leq k-2)W\int_0^\infty x(1+x)^{W-1}e^{-\lambda x}dx \leq C(\eta_k+1)(\frac{k}{\lambda}+\frac{(k-\lambda)^2}{\lambda}). \quad (4.14)$$

Proof. By integration by parts and (4.10),

$$\begin{aligned}
&EI(W+1 \leq k-2)\int_0^\infty x(1+x)^{(W+1)-1}e^{-\lambda x}dx \\
= \;& -\int_0^{k-2}\big(\int_0^\infty x(1+x)^{t-1}e^{-\lambda x}dx\big)dP(W+1>t) \\
= \;& -\big(\int_0^\infty x(1+x)^{t-1}e^{-\lambda x}dx\big)P(W+1>t)\Big|_0^{k-2} \\
& +\int_0^{k-2}P(W+1>t)\frac{d}{dt}\big(\int_0^\infty x(1+x)^{t-1}e^{-\lambda x}dx\big)dt \\
\leq \;& C(\eta_k+1)\big(\int_0^\infty x(1+x)^{(k-2)-1}e^{-\lambda x}dx\big)P(Y+1>k-2) \\
& +C(\eta_k+1)EI(Y+1 \leq k-2)\int_0^\infty x(1+x)^{(Y+1)-1}e^{-\lambda x}dx.
\end{aligned}$$

From (4.8) it follows that for $k-2 \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\big(\int_0^\infty x(1+x)^{(k-2)-1}e^{-\lambda x}dx\big)P(Y+1>k-2) \\
= \;& \big[\frac{e^\lambda (k-2)!}{\lambda^{k-1}}P(Y \leq k-2)-\frac{e^\lambda (k-3)!}{\lambda^{k-2}}P(Y \leq k-3)\big]P(Y \geq k-2) \\
\leq \;& \frac{e^\lambda (k-2)!}{\lambda^{k-1}}P(Y=k-2)P(Y \geq k-2)+\frac{e^\lambda (k-3)!}{\lambda^{k-2}}(\frac{k-2}{\lambda}-1)P(Y \geq k-2) \\
\leq \;& \frac{P(Y \geq k-2)}{\lambda}+\frac{e^\lambda (k-3)!}{\lambda^{k-2}}\frac{(k-2-\lambda)^+}{\lambda}P(Y=k-2)\frac{P(Y \geq k-2)}{P(Y=k-2)} \\
\leq \;& 2/\lambda
\end{aligned}$$

by (4.4). Using (4.8) again, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& EI(Y+1\leq k-2)\int_0^\infty x(1+x)^{(Y+1)-1}e^{-\lambda x}dx \\
= & \sum_{j=1}^{k-2}\int_0^\infty x(1+x)^{j-1}e^{-\lambda x}dxP(Y+1=j) \\
= & \sum_{j=1}^{k-2}\big[\frac{e^\lambda j!}{\lambda^{j+1}}P(Y\leq j)-\frac{e^\lambda (j-1)!}{\lambda^j}P(Y\leq j-1)\big]P(Y=j-1) \\
\leq & \sum_{j=1}^{k-2}\frac{P(Y=j-1)}{\lambda}+\sum_{j>\lambda}^{k-2}\frac{j-\lambda}{\lambda^2}\leq\frac{1}{\lambda}+\frac{(k-\lambda)^2}{\lambda^2}
\end{aligned}$$

This proves (4.13). Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
& EI(W\leq k-2)W\int_0^\infty x(1+x)^{W-1}e^{-\lambda x}dx \\
\leq & \; C(\eta_k+1)(k-2)\big(\int_0^\infty x(1+x)^{(k-2)-1}e^{-\lambda x}dx\big)P(Y>k-2) \\
& +C(\eta_k+1)EI(Y\leq k-2)Y\int_0^\infty x(1+x)^{Y-1}e^{-\lambda x}dx \\
\leq & \; C(\eta_k+1)\frac{2k}{\lambda}+C(\eta_k+1)(1+\frac{(k-\lambda)^2}{\lambda}) \\
\leq & \; C(\eta_k+1)(\frac{k}{\lambda}+\frac{(k-\lambda)^2}{\lambda}),
\end{aligned}$$

which shows that (4.14) holds. □

Next we prove Theorem 2.1.

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Recall $f:=f_h$ is the solution to the Stein equation (4.5) with $h(w)=I(w\geq k)$ for $k\geq\lambda$. From (4.5) and the definition of the neighborhood B_i, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& P(W\geq k)-P(Y\geq k) \\
= & \sum_{i\in\mathcal{J}}EX_i[f(V_i+1)-f(W)]+\sum_{i\in\mathcal{J}}p_iE[f(W+1)-f(V_i+1)] \\
=: & \; H_3+H_4
\end{aligned}$$

where $V_i:=\sum_{j\notin B_i}X_j$.

We bound H_4 first. Write $\{X_k : k \in B_i\} = \{X_{ij} : 1 \le j \le |B_i|\}$ where $|B_i|$ is the cardinality of B_i and $X_{i,|B_i|} = X_i$. Then by the definitions of $\tilde{p}, m$, and the properties of f, (4.6), (4.7) and (4.8),

$$
\begin{aligned}
|H_4| \le\ & \sum_{i\in\mathcal{J}} p_i E \sum_{j=1}^{|B_i|} X_{ij} \Big| f(V_i + \sum_{l=1}^{j-1} X_{il} + 1) - f(V_i + \sum_{l=1}^{j} X_{il} + 1)\Big| \\
& \times \big[I(V_i + \sum_{l=1}^{j-1} X_{il} + 1 \ge k-1) + I(V_i + \sum_{l=1}^{j-1} X_{il} + 1 \le k-2)\big] \\
\le\ & \tilde{p} E \sum_{i\in\mathcal{J}} \sum_{j=1}^{|B_i|} X_{ij} \Big\{ \frac{C I(V_i + \sum_{l=1}^{j-1} X_{il} + 1 \ge k-1)}{V_i + \sum_{l=1}^{j-1} X_{il} + 1} \\
& + P(Y \ge k) \int_0^\infty x(1+x)^{(V_i + \sum_{l=1}^{j-1} X_{il} + 1) - 1} e^{-\lambda x} dx I(V_i + \sum_{l=1}^{j-1} X_{il} + 1 \le k-2) \Big\} \\
\le\ & \tilde{p} E \sum_{i\in\mathcal{J}} \sum_{j=1}^{|B_i|} X_{ij} \Big\{ \frac{CmI(W \ge k-1)}{W} \\
& + P(Y \ge k) \int_0^\infty x(1+x)^{[W\wedge(k-2)]-1} e^{-\lambda x} dx I(W \le k+m, 1 \le k-2) \Big\} \\
\le\ & m\tilde{p} \Big\{ CmP(W \ge k-1) \\
& + P(Y \ge k) EWI(1 \le k-2 < W \le k+m) \int_0^\infty x(1+x)^{(k-2)-1} e^{-\lambda x} dx \\
& + P(Y \ge k) EWI(1 \le W \le k-2) \int_0^\infty x(1+x)^{W-1} e^{-\lambda x} dx \Big\}.
\end{aligned}
$$

By (4.10), (4.3), (4.14) and (4.15) of Lemma 4.4 (which will be proved later),

$$
|H_4| \le CP(Y \ge k)(\eta_k + 1)\big[m^2 \tilde{p} \frac{k}{\lambda} + m\tilde{p} \frac{(k-\lambda)^2}{\lambda}\big].
$$

Let $c_1 \ge 1$ be an absolute constant to be chosen later such that $c_1 km < \theta$. By condition (2.3) and the upper bound $|f(w) - f(w+1)| \le 1 \wedge \frac{1}{\lambda}$ for all integers

$w \geq 1$ (see, for example, Barbour, Holst and Janson (1992)),

$$\begin{aligned}
|H_3| &\leq \sum_{i\in\mathcal{J}} EX_i \sum_{j=1}^{|B_i|-1} X_{ij}\Big|f(V_i+\sum_{l=1}^{j-1}X_{il}+1)-f(V_i+\sum_{l=1}^{j}X_{il}+1)\Big| \\
&\quad \times\big[I(W\leq c_1km)+I(c_1km<W\leq\theta)+I(W>\theta)\big] \\
&\leq \sum_{i\in\mathcal{J}} EX_i \sum_{j=1}^{|B_i|-1} X_{ij}\Big|f(V_i+\sum_{l=1}^{j-1}X_{il}+1)-f(V_i+\sum_{l=1}^{j}X_{il}+1)\Big|I(W\leq c_1km) \\
&\quad +\delta(1\wedge\frac{1}{\lambda})EW^2I(c_1km<W\leq\theta)+(1\wedge\frac{1}{\lambda})mEWI(W>\theta) \\
&=: H_{3,1}+H_{3,2}+H_{3,3}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly as for $|H_4|$, $H_{3,1}$ can be bounded as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
&H_{3,1} \\
\leq\ & \sum_{i\in\mathcal{J}} EX_i \sum_{j=1}^{|B_i|-1} X_{ij}\Big\{\frac{CI(V_i+\sum_{l=1}^{j-1}X_{il}+1\geq k-1)}{V_i+\sum_{l=1}^{j-1}X_{il}+1}I(W\leq c_1km) \\
&+P(Y\geq k)\int_0^\infty x(1+x)^{(V_i+\sum_{l=1}^{j-1}X_{il}+1)-1}e^{-\lambda x}dxI(V_i+\sum_{l=1}^{j-1}X_{il}+1\leq k-2)\Big\} \\
\leq\ & \sum_{i\in\mathcal{J}} EX_i \sum_{j=1}^{|B_i|-1} X_{ij}\Big\{\frac{CmI(W\geq k-1)}{W}I(W\leq c_1km) \\
&+P(Y\geq k)\int_0^\infty x(1+x)^{[W\wedge(k-2)]-1}e^{-\lambda x}dxI(W\leq k+m, 1\leq k-2)\Big\} \\
\leq\ & \delta EWCmI(k-1\leq W\leq c_1km) \\
&+\delta P(Y\geq k)EW^2I(1\leq k-2<W\leq k+m)\int_0^\infty x(1+x)^{(k-2)-1}e^{-\lambda x}dx \\
&+\delta P(Y\geq k)EW^2I(1\leq W\leq k-2)\int_0^\infty x(1+x)^{W-1}e^{-\lambda x}dx \\
\leq\ & CP(Y\geq k)(\eta_k+1)\delta m^2(\lambda+(k-\lambda)^2+\frac{(k-\lambda)^3}{\lambda})
\end{aligned}$$

by (4.10), (4.3), and (4.15) and (4.16) of lemma 4.4 (which will be proved later).

From (4.18) and (4.19) of Lemma 4.5 (which will be proved later), there exists an absolute positive constant C such that for $c_1 > C$ and $k < \theta/Cm$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&H_{3,2}+H_{3,3} \\
\leq\ & P(Y\geq k)(1\wedge\frac{1}{\lambda})\big[\delta m^2+m^2\exp(-\frac{c\theta}{m})\big].
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}|H_3| &\le CP(Y\ge k)(\eta_k+1)\delta m^2(\lambda+(k-\lambda)^2+\frac{(k-\lambda)^3}{\lambda})\\ &\quad +P(Y\ge k)(1\wedge\frac{1}{\lambda})m^2\exp(-\frac{c\theta}{m}).\end{aligned}$$

From the bounds on $|H_3|$ and $|H_4|$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}|\frac{P(W\ge k)}{P(Y\ge k)}-1| &\le C(\eta_k+1)m^2\Big\{\frac{\tilde p}{\lambda}(\lambda+(k-\lambda)^2)+\delta(\lambda+(k-\lambda)^2+\frac{(k-\lambda)^3}{\lambda})\Big\}\\ &\quad +(1\wedge\frac{1}{\lambda})m^2\exp(-C\theta),\end{aligned}$$

Since the right-hand side of the above bound is increasing in k, we obtain the following recursive inequality for η_k.

$$\begin{aligned}|\eta_k-1| &\le C(\eta_k+1)m^2\Big\{\frac{\tilde p}{\lambda}(\lambda+(k-\lambda)^2)+\delta(\lambda+(k-\lambda)^2+\frac{(k-\lambda)^3}{\lambda})\Big\}\\ &\quad +(1\wedge\frac{1}{\lambda})m^2\exp(-\frac{c\theta}{m}).\end{aligned}$$

Solving the above inequality yields Theorem 2.1. □

Finally we prove the lemmas used in the proof of Theorem 2.1.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $Y\sim Poi(\lambda)$ with $\lambda>0$. Let W be an integer valued random variable and for integers $k\ge\lambda$, let η_k be defined in* (4.9)*. Then we have*

$$EW^2I(1\le k-2<W\le k+m)\int_0^\infty x(1+x)^{(k-2)-1}e^{-\lambda x}dx\le C\frac{(k+m)^2}{\lambda}(\eta_k+1) \tag{4.15}$$

and

$$EW^2(1\le W\le k-2)\int_0^\infty x(1+x)^{W-1}e^{-\lambda x}dx\le C(\eta_k+1)(\lambda+(k-\lambda)^2+\frac{(k-\lambda)^3}{\lambda}). \tag{4.16}$$

Proof. By (4.10), (4.8) and (4.4),

$$\begin{aligned}
& EW^2 I(1\le k-2<W\le k+m)\int_0^\infty x(1+x)^{(k-2)-1}e^{-\lambda x}dx \\
\le\ & (k+m)^2\frac{P(W\ge k-1)}{P(Y\ge k-1)}P(Y\ge k-1>1)\int_0^\infty x(1+x)^{(k-2)-1}e^{\lambda x}dx \\
\le\ & (k+m)^2 C(\eta_k+1)P(Y\ge k-1>1)\big[\frac{e^\lambda (k-2)!}{\lambda^{k-1}}P(Y=k-2) \\
& \qquad +\frac{e^\lambda (k-3)!}{\lambda^{k-2}}\frac{k-2-\lambda}{\lambda}I(k-2>\lambda)\big] \\
\le\ & (k+m)^2 C(\eta_k+1)\big[\frac{1}{\lambda}+\frac{kI(k-2>\lambda)}{(k-1)(k-2)}\big] \\
\le\ & C\frac{(k+m)^2}{\lambda}(\eta_k+1).
\end{aligned}$$

Similar to the proof of (4.14),

$$\begin{aligned}
& EW^2(1\le W\le k-2)\int_0^\infty x(1+x)^{W-1}e^{-\lambda x}dx \\
\le\ & C(\eta_k+1)(k-2)^2\Big(\int_0^\infty x(1+x)^{(k-2)-1}e^{-\lambda x}dx\Big)P(Y>k-2\ge 1) \\
& +C(\eta_k+1)EY^2 I(1\le Y\le k-2)\int_0^\infty x(1+x)^{Y-1}e^{-\lambda x}dx.
\end{aligned}$$

For the first term, applying (4.8) and (4.4),

$$\begin{aligned}
& (k-2)^2\Big(\int_0^\infty x(1+x)^{(k-2)-1}e^{-\lambda x}dx\Big)P(Y>k-2\ge 1) \\
=\ & (k-2)^2\big[\frac{e^\lambda (k-2)!}{\lambda^{k-1}}P(Y\le k-2) \\
& \qquad -\frac{e^\lambda (k-3)!}{\lambda^{k-2}}P(Y\le k-3)\big]P(Y>k-2\ge 1) \\
\le\ & (k-2)^2\frac{e^\lambda (k-2)!}{\lambda^{k-1}}P(Y=k-2)P(Y>k-2\ge 1) \\
& +(k-2)^2\frac{e^\lambda (k-3)!}{\lambda^{k-2}}\frac{k-2-\lambda}{\lambda}P(Y>k-2\ge 1) \\
\le\ & \frac{2k^2}{\lambda}.
\end{aligned}$$

For the second term,

$$\begin{aligned}
& EY^2 I(1 \le Y \le k-2)\int_0^\infty x(1+x)^{Y-1}e^{-\lambda x}dx \\
= & \sum_{j=1}^{k-2} j^2 \int_0^\infty x(1+x)^{j-1}e^{-\lambda x}dx P(Y=j) \\
= & \sum_{j=1}^{k-2} j^2 \big[\frac{e^\lambda j!}{\lambda^{j+1}}P^2(Y=j) + \frac{e^\lambda (j-1)!}{\lambda^j}\frac{j-\lambda}{\lambda}P(Y \le j-1)P(Y=j)\big] \\
\le & \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{k-2} j^2 P(Y=j)}{\lambda} + \sum_{j>\lambda}^{k-2} j\frac{j-\lambda}{\lambda} \\
\le & 1+\lambda+(k-\lambda)^2+\frac{(k-\lambda)^3}{\lambda}.
\end{aligned}$$

The inequality (4.16) is proved by combining the above bounds. □

To prove the next lemma, we need the following Bennett-Hoeffding inequality. Let $\{\xi_i, 1 \le i \le n\}$ be independent random variables. Assume that $E\xi_i \le 0$, $\xi_i \le a (a > 0)$ for each $1 \le i \le n$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n E\xi_i^2 \le B_n^2$. Then for $x > 0$

$$P(\sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i \ge x) \le \exp(-\frac{B_n^2}{a^2}\{(1+\frac{ax}{B_n^2})\log(1+\frac{ax}{B_n^2}) - \frac{ax}{B_n^2}\})$$

In particular, for $x > 4B_n^2/a$

$$P(\sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i \ge x) \le \exp(-\frac{x}{2a}\log(1+\frac{ax}{B_n^2})) \tag{4.17}$$

Lemma 4.5. *Let W be defined as in Theorem 2.1. Then there exists an absolute constant C such that for $k \ge \lambda, \theta > Ckm$ and $c_1 > C$, we have*

$$EWI(W > \theta) \le Cm\exp(-\frac{\theta}{8m}\log(1+\frac{\theta}{2m\lambda})), \tag{4.18}$$

$$EW^2 I(W > c_1 km) \le Cc_1 km^2 \exp(-\frac{c_1 k}{8}\log(1+\frac{c_1 k}{2\lambda})). \tag{4.19}$$

Proof. We follow the proof of Lemma 8.2 in Shao and Zhou (2012). Separate $\mathcal{J}$ into $\mathcal{J}_l, 1 \le l \le m$ such that for each l, $X_i, i \in \mathcal{J}_l$ are independent. This can be done by coloring $\{X_i : i \in \mathcal{J}\}$ one by one such that the $X's$ with the same color are independent. The total number of colors used can be controlled by m because of the assumption (2.2). Write

$$W_l = \sum_{i\in\mathcal{J}_l} X_i.$$

Then for $c_2 > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} EWI(W > 2c_2m) &= 2c_2mP(W > 2c_2m) + 2m\int_{c_2}^{\infty} P(W > 2tm)dt \\ &\le 2E(W - c_2m)^+ + 2\int_{c_2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{t}E(W - tm)^+dt \\ &\le 2\sum_{1\le l\le m} E(W_l - c_2)^+ + 2\sum_{1\le l\le m}\int_{c_2}^{\infty}\frac{1}{t}E(W_l - t)^+dt \end{aligned}$$

For $s > 5\lambda_l := 5\sum_{i\in\mathcal{J}_l} p_i$, by (4.17),

$$P(W_l > s) \le \exp(-\frac{s}{4}\log(1 + \frac{s}{\lambda_l})).$$

For $t \ge c_2 > 5\lambda_l$,

$$\begin{aligned} E(W_l - t)^+ &= \int_t^{\infty} P(W_l > s)ds \\ &\le \int_t^{\infty} \exp(-\frac{s}{4}\log(1 + \frac{s}{\lambda_l}))ds \\ &\le 4\exp(-\frac{t}{4}\log(1 + t/\lambda_l)), \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{c_2}^{\infty}\frac{1}{t}E(W_l - t)^+dt &\le 4\int_{c_2}^{\infty}\frac{1}{t}\exp(-\frac{t}{4}\log(1 + t/\lambda_l))dt \\ &\le \frac{16}{c_2}\exp(-\frac{c_2}{4}\log(1 + c_2/\lambda_l)). \end{aligned}$$

Combining inequalities above yields

$$EWI(W > 2c_2m) \le 8m\exp(-\frac{c_2}{4}\log(1 + c_2/\lambda))(1 + 4/c_2). \tag{4.20}$$

Similarly, for c_1 big enough,

$$\begin{aligned}
&EW^2 I(W > c_1 km)\\
&= c_1^2 k^2 m^2 P(W > c_1 km) + 2\int_{c_1 km}^{\infty} xP(W > x)dx\\
&\le \frac{c_1^2 k^2 m^2}{c_1 km/2} E(W - \frac{c_1 km}{2})^+ + 4\int_{c_1 km}^{\infty} E(W - \frac{x}{2})^+ dx\\
&\le 2c_1 km \sum_{1\le l\le m} E(W_l - \frac{c_1 k}{2})^+ + 4\sum_{1\le l\le m}\int_{c_1 km}^{\infty} E(W_l - \frac{x}{2m})^+ dx\\
&\le 8c_1 km^2 \exp(-\frac{c_1 k}{8}\log(1 + \frac{c_1 k}{2\lambda})) + 16m\int_{c_1 km}^{\infty} \exp(-\frac{x}{8m}\log(1 + \frac{x}{2m\lambda}))dx\\
&\le 8c_1 km^2 \exp(-\frac{c_1 k}{8}\log(1 + \frac{c_1 k}{2\lambda})) + 128m^2 \exp(-\frac{c_1 k}{8}\log(1 + \frac{c_1 k}{2\lambda})).
\end{aligned}$$

This proves (4.19). □

Acknowledgment

Louis Chen and Xiao Fang were partially supported by Grant C-389-000-010-101 at the National University of Singapore. Qi-Man Shao was partially supported by Hong Kong RGC CERG-602608 and 603710.

References

Arratia, R., Goldstein, L. and Gordon, L. (1989). Two moments suffice for Poisson approximations: the Chen-Stein method. *Ann. Probab.* **17**, 9-25.

Arratia, R., Goldstein, L. and Gordon, L. (1990). Poisson approximation and the Chen-Stein method. With comments and a rejoinder by the authors. *Statist. Sci.* **5**, 403-434.

Baldi, P., Rinott, Y. and Stein, C. (1989). A normal approximation for the number of local maxima of a random function on a graph. *Probability, statistics, and mathematics*, 59–81, Academic Press, Boston, MA.

Barbour, A. D. (1982). Poisson convergence and random graphs. *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* **92**, 349-359.

Barbour, A. D., Chen, L. H. Y. and Choi, K. P. (1995). Poisson approximation for unbounded functions, I: Independent summands. *Statist. Sinica* **2**, 749-766.

Barbour, A. D., Holst, L. and Janson, S. (1992). *Poisson approximation.* Oxford Studies in Probability **2**. Oxford Science Publications.

Chatterjee, S., Diaconis, P. and Meckes, E. (2005). Exchangeable pairs and Poisson approximation. *Probab. Surv.* **2**, 64-106.

Chen, L. H. Y. (1975). Poisson approximation for dependent trials. *Ann. Probab.* **3**, 534-545.

Chen, L. H. Y. and Choi, K. P. (1992). Some asymptotic and large deviation results in Poisson approximation. *Ann. Probab.* **20**, 1867-1876.

Goldstein, L. and Rinott, Y. (1996). Multivariate normal approximations by Stein's method and size bias couplings. *J. Appl. Probab.* **33**, 1-17.

Shao, Q. M. and Zhou, W. X. (2012). Cramér type moderate deviations for studentized non-linear statistics. *Preprint.*

Stein, C. (1986). *Approximate computation of expectations.* Institute of Mathematical Statistics Lecture Notes-Monograph Series, **7**. Institute of Mathematical Statistics, Hayward, CA,

Department of Mathematics, National University of Singapore, 10 Lower Kent Ridge Road, Singapore 119076, Republic of Singapore.

E-mail: (matchyl@nus.edu.sg)

Department of Statistics and Applied Probability, National University of Singapore, 6 Science Drive 2, Singapore 117546, Republic of Singapore.

E-mail: (fangwd2003@gmail.com)

Department of Mathematics, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Clear Water Bay, Kowloon, Hong Kong, P.R. China.

E-mail: (maqmshao@ust.hk)